

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 30 September 2004. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Official Action, Claims 8, 14, 15 and 19 has been amended to clarify the language thereof and Claims 1, 6 – 8 and 10 – 13 have been further amended to clarify the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Claims 2 – 5 have been canceled by this Amendment. Such amendment and cancellation of Claims are made in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this case, and without addressing the merits of the Examiner's substantive rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter as claimed in Claim 11 for reciting the limitation “and has independent buffer displacement” and stated that the limitation is not found in the specification. This limitation can be found verbatim on Page 9, lines 2 – 3 in the Subject Patent Application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also objected to Claims 8 and 12 due to informalities. Claims 8 has been amended to correct the informalities. Claim 12 has been canceled and its limitations have been included in its base claim 10 with required corrections to the informalities incorporated.

The Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner rejected Claim 15 for reciting “a second end” and stated that this was a “non-sequitur” limitation. Since Claim 15 is dependent on Claim 14, Claim 14 has been amended to include an explicit reference to “a second end” following the recitation of “each of the two wheels seats... has a first end formed”. Claim 15 has also been amended to refer to the second end with proper antecedent basis in Claim 14. The Examiner rejected Claim 19 for not providing sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the fixing portion”. Claim 19 has been amended to remove this informality. Thus, it is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 4 and 10 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson (U.S. Patent #4,176,850). The Examiner also rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. Patent #4,176,850) in view of Grossman (U. S. Patent #4,645,223). However, the Examiner kindly stated that Claims 5 – 9, 12 – 14, and 16 – 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner also stated that Claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this case, the subject matter of Claim 5 and its intervening Claims 2 – 4 have now been incorporated into Claim 1 as an effective re-write of Claim 5, with Claims 2 – 5 being cancelled. Claims 6-8 and 10 have been amended to depend from Claim 1 rather than from canceled Claim 5. It is believed, therefore, that Claim 1 and each of the Claims now depending therefrom, including Claim 19, are now in allowable form.

Additionally, Claim 12 has now been amended to independent form incorporating therein each of its base and intervening Claims. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from Claim 12. Thus, it is believed that Claims 11 and 12 are now in allowable form.

Likewise, Claim 13 has now been amended to Independent form incorporating therein each of its base and intervening Claims. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that Claim 13 and Claims 14-18 which ultimately depend therefrom are now in allowable form as well.

Again, such amendment and cancellation of Claims are submitted in light of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and purely in the interests of expediting prosecution of this case. Such amendment and cancellation of Claims are submitted without addressing the Examiner's substantive rejections under §§ 102 and 103.

MR2549-58


Application Serial No. 10/612,907

Responsive to Office Action dated 30 September 2004

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jun Y. Lee', written over the printed name.

Jun Y. Lee

Registration #40,262

Dated: 12/9/2004

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678